



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/522,525

11/01/2005

David Dakin Iorwerth Wright

07588.0080

7399

22852

7590

01/07/2009

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

BROWN, COURTNEY A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/07/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/522,525	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WRIGHT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> COURTNEY BROWN	<b>Art Unit</b> 1616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) COURTNEY BROWN. (3) Anthony Tridico.

(2) Johann Richter. (4) Brenda Huneycutt.

Date of Interview: 19 December 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The previous nonstatutory obvious- type double patenting rejection over copending applications 11/174,293 and 11/225,869 were discussed. The Examiner informed Applicant that a 35 USC 103(a) obviousness-type double patenting rejection will be made over the teaching of Osman et al.(USPN 6572873). Applicant agreed to file a response stating why the aforementioned nonstatutory obvious- type double patenting rejections are traversed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Johann R. Richter/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616
--	---